

## **REMARKS**

### **Introduction**

The March 21, 2005 Final Office Action has been reviewed and its contents carefully noted. Reconsideration of this case, as amended and in view of the arguments made herein, is respectfully requested. Claims 17 through 28 and Claims 30 through 42 are currently pending. Claims 17 through 28, 30 through 34 and 38 through 42 were allowed in the Final Office Action. By this Amendment, rejected Claims 35 through 37 have been canceled and Claims 30 and 42 have been amended to correct minor grammatical issues noted by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully maintains that Claims 17 through 28, 30 through 34 and 38 through 42 are in condition for allowance. Applicant maintains that this Amendment is supported by the application, as originally-filed, and respectfully requests that this Amendment be entered. Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

### **Objections to the Claims and the Specification**

In paragraph 1 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner stated that Applicant's amendment filed on December 6, 2004 was improper because the amendment indicated page 8, line 15 as the location of the paragraph being replaced; however, the replaced paragraph actually begins on page 8, line 8. In response, Applicant has amended the corrected the amendment and requested replacement of the paragraph beginning on page 8, line 8 of the application as originally-filed to add the words "adjacent thereto" and, therefore, requests withdrawal of this objection.

In paragraph 2 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner requested correction of grammatical errors on page 6, line 17; page 6, line 24 and page 9, line 21. In response, Applicant has amended the following paragraphs to correct the grammatical errors identified by the

Examiner: the paragraph on page 6, beginning at line 16; the paragraph on page 6, beginning at line 24 and the paragraph on page 9, beginning at line 19. Applicant therefore requests withdrawal of these objections.

In paragraph 3 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 30 through 34, 37 and 42 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(a) for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. In response, Applicant has amended Claims 30 and 42 and canceled Claim 37 and, therefore, requests withdrawal of these objections.

#### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

In the Office Action, Claims 35 through 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Krupka, et al., EP 575100 (hereinafter, the “‘100 Patent”). The Examiner stated that the ‘100 Patent discloses “transmitting a connectivity interrogation signal to a first socket contact proximate a first data port”. The Examiner further stated that the ‘100 Patent discloses “scanning said plurality of input latches for an indication of receipt of said connectivity interrogation signal at a second socket contact proximate a second data port”.

In response, in an attempt to advance the prosecution but without conceding either the need for amendment or the correctness of the Examiner’s position, Applicant has canceled Claims 35 through 37. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

#### **Conclusion**

Applicant believes that the Claims in the present invention are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks.

Any additional fees or charges necessary in connection with the present application are hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4709.

Respectfully submitted,

 43,591

Steven B. Pokotilow

Registration No. 26,405

Attorney for Applicant

Stroock & Stroock & Lavan LLP

180 Maiden Lane

New York, NY 10038

(212) 806-5400

